GOVERNMENT OF ANDHRA PRADESH
ABSTRACT

Public Services – Revenue Department – Sri S. Bhaskara Reddy, Revenue Divisional Officer, Bheemunipatnam Visakhapatnam District– Disciplinary proceedings under rule – 20 r/w rule - 24 of Andhra Pradesh Civil Services (Classification Control and Appeal) Rules, 1991 – Articles of charge – Issued.

REVENUE (VIGILANCE-I) DEPARTMENT

G.O.RT.No. 632 Dated: 18-09-2024

G.O.Ms.No.197, Rev. (Vig.I) Dept., dt: 18.09.2024

-0o0-

ORDER:

In pursuance to the G.O read above, it is proposed to hold an enquiry against Sri S. Bhaskara Reddy, Revenue Divisional Officer, Bheemunipatnam Visakhapatnam District in accordance with the procedure laid down in Rule 20 of the Andhra Pradesh Civil Services (Classification, Control and Appeal) Rules, 1991.

2. The substance of the imputations of misconduct or misbehaviour in respect of which the inquiry is proposed to be held is set out in the enclosed statement of articles of charge (Annexure- I). A statement of imputations of misconduct / misbehaviour in support of each article of charge is enclosed (Annexure-II). A list of documents by which, and a list of witnesses by whom, the articles of charge proposed to be sustained are also enclosed (Annexures-III)

3. Sri S. Bhaskara Reddy, Revenue Divisional Officer, Bheemunipatnam Visakhapatnam District is directed to submit, within 10 days from the date of receipt of this order, a written statement of his defence.

4. Sri S. Bhaskara Reddy, Revenue Divisional Officer, Bheemunipatnam Visakhapatnam District is informed that an inquiry will be held only in respect of those articles of charge as are not admitted. He should, therefore, specifically admit or deny each article of charge. 5. Sri S. Bhaskara Reddy, Revenue Divisional Officer, Bheemunipatnam Visakhapatnam District further informed that if he does not submit his written statement of defence on or before the date specified in para 3 above, further action will be processed based on the material available.

6. Attention of Sri S. Bhaskara Reddy, Revenue Divisional Officer, Bheemunipatnam Visakhapatnam District is invited to Rule 24 of the Andhra Pradesh Civil Services (Conduct) Rules, 1964, under which no Government Servant shall bring or attempt to bring any political or outside influence to bear upon any superior authority to further his interest in respect of matters pertaining to her service under the Government. If any representation is received on her behalf from another person in respect of any matter dealt within these proceedings, it will be presumed that Sri S. Bhaskara Reddy, Revenue Divisional Officer, Bheemunipatnam Visakhapatnam District is aware of such a representation and that it has been made at his instance and action will be taken against her for violation of Rule 24 of the Andhra Pradesh Civil Services (Conduct) Rules, 1964.

7. The receipt of the Order be acknowledged.

(BY ORDER AND IN THE NAME OF THE GOVERNOR OF ANDHRA PRADESH)

R.P. SISODIA
SPECIAL CHIEF SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT (LANDS, R&S)

To
Sri S. Bhaskara Reddy, Revenue Divisional Officer, Bheemunipatnam Visakhapatnam District.
(Through the Chief Commissioner of Land Administration, A.P., Mangalagiri for service and to return the served copy with dated acknowledgement immediately (By RPAD))
The Chief Commissioner of Land Administration, A.P., Mangalagiri
Copy to:
The District Collector, Visakhapatnam District.
SF/SC.

//FORWARDED::BY ORDER//

SECTION OFFICER

ANNEXURE-I

STATEMENT OF ARTICLES OF CHARGE FRAMED AGAINST SRI S. BHASKARA REDDY, THE THEN REVENUE DIVISIONAL OFFICER, BHEEMUNIPATNAM.

***

ARTICLE OF CHARGE No.1:

That it has come to notice of the undersigned that the Tahsildar, Visakhapatnam (Rural) vide Rc.No.383/2023/A, dt.21.06.2023 and the Revenue Divisional Officer, Bheemunipatnam vide Rc.No.1187/2023/B, dt.08.08.2023, while furnishing the proposals based on the request of I.Srinivasa Rao requesting to issue of e-pattadar pass book and SD records as per the Settlement orders S.R.No.11(a)/23/68/Vsp Dt.29.11.1969 with respect to the land in Sy.No.133/p of measuring Ac.3.47Cts. In the said proposals, it was reported that the subject land in Sy.No.133 measures a total extent of Ac.9.36Cts and classified as Poramboke Rasta and in the Adangal Fasli 1419 the same is recorded in the name of APHB (VUDA) and in webland the same is recorded as Government land. It was further reported that as per the Settlement orders S.R.No.11(a)/23/68/Vsp., dt.29.11.1969 the claim was allowed in favour of Sri Nagothu Appalaswamy Patrudu for an extent of Ac.3.47Cts in Old Sy.No.281 R.S.No.133P and the Revenue Divisional Officer, Bheemunipatnam further reported that he had inspected that land measuring Ac.3.47Cts in Sy.No.133ofMadhurawada village along with Tahsildar and Field staff and found that the land in Sy.No.133 is vacant on ground and there is no road existing on the ground and that from that FMB also there is no formation of the road. Finally, it was reported that there is no dispute or any court cases pending on the subject land and requested to conform the genuineness of the settlement order from Collector's office.

The Executive Engineer, AP Housing Board, Visakhapatnam vide letter No.533/Police case/PMP/EE-VSP, dt.07.08.2023 fled a police complaint and submitted that the Government has alienated an extent of Ac.9.36Cts in Sy.No.133 of Madhurawada, Visakhapatnam (Rural) Mandal and that the advance possession of the land was handed over on 12.05.2005 and alienated vide G.O.Ms.No.1551, Revenue (Assn-I) Dept D1.19.12.2007 and that they have erected boundaries with pillars on the subject land and intended to develop the land.

It was noticed that Sri S. Bhaskara Reddy, Revenue Divisional Officer, Bheemunipatnam who worked in the capacity of MRO, Visakhapatnam (Rural) has handed over the lands to the AP Housing Board in year 2005. But, it was reported now by the Revenue Divisional Officer, Bheemunipatnam that he has inspected the lands and that there are no disputes and court cases pending on the land. The report of the Revenue Divisional Officer, Bheemunipatnam is silent on the alienation aspect and it is only seemed to be a proposal made in favour of I.Srinivasa Rao on strength of an unauthenticated documents, In spite of reporting that the name of AP Housing Board is recorded in the Adangal Fasli 1419, the officers did not care to place the fact of alienation in their reports. This exhibits negligence and carelessness on part of the officers who have submitted a spurious and misleading report to the higher officials. Besides this the above reports also goes to give scope to the applicant to complicate the issue on the strength of such erroneous reports.

The above mentioned acts of Sri S. Bhaskara Reddy, Revenue Divisional Officer, Bheemunipatnam, Visakhapatnam District goes to show that being a responsible official for protection of all the Government lands under his jurisdiction, holding a post of Mandal Revenue Inspector, he failed to maintain absolute integrity, discipline, impartiality and not acted diligently and acted irresponsible towards his duties and shown dereliction in discharging his legitimate duties by violating the Rule 3(1) of A.P. Civil Services (Conduct) Rules, 1964: Every Government employee shall be devoted to his duty and shall maintain absolute integrity, discipline, impartiality and a sense of propriety, Rule 3(2) of A.P. Civil Services (Conduct) Rules, 1964: No Government employee shall behave in a manner which is unbecoming of such employee or derogatory to the prestige of Government and Rule-3 (3) of A.P. Civil Services (Conduct) Rules, 1964: No Government employee act in a manner which will place his official position under any kind embarrassment, Hence, the charge.

R.P. SISODIA
SPECIAL CHIEF SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT (LANDS, R&S)

//FORWARDED::BY ORDER//

SECTION OFFICER

ANNEXURE-II

STATEMENT OF IMPUTATIONS OF MISCONDUCT OR MISBEHAVIOUR IN SUPPORT OF THE ARTICLE OF CHARGES FRAMED AGAINST SRI S. BHASKARA REDDY, REVENUE DIVISIONAL OFFICER, BHEEMUNIPATNAM, VISAKHAPATNAM DISTRICT.

###

Despite issue of repeated instructions to field functionaries by the District Administration also, Sri S. Bhaskara Reddy, Revenue Divisional Officer, Bheemunipatnam it has come to the notice of the undersigned that the Tahsildar, Visakhapatnam (Rural) vide Rc.No.383/2023/A, dt.21.06.2023 and the Revenue Divisional Officer, Bheemunipatnam vide Rc.No.1187/2023/0 dt.08.08.2023, while furnishing the proposals based on the request of I. Srinivasa Rao requesting to issue of e-pattadar pass book and SD records as per the Settlement orders S.R.No.11(a)/23/68/Vsp Dt.29.11.1969 with respect to the land in Sy.No.133/p of measuring Ac.3.47Cts. In the said proposals, it was reported that the subject land in Sy.No.133 measures a total extent of Ac 9.36Cts and classified as Poramboke Rasta and in the Adangal Fasli 1419 the same is recorded in the name of APHB (VUDA) and in webland the same is recorded as Government land. It was further reported that as per the Settlement orders S.R.No.11(a)/23/68/Vsp., dt.29.11.1969 the claim was allowed to favour of Sri Nagothu Appalaswamy Patrudu for an extent of Ac.3.47Cts in Old Sy.No.281 R.S.No.133P. It was further informed that the Revenue Divisional Officer Bheemunipatnam further reported that he had inspected the land measuring Ac.3.47Cts in Sy.No.133 of Madhurawada village along with Tahsildar and Field staff and found that the land in Sy.No. 133 is vacant on ground and there is no road existing on the ground and that from the FMB also there is no formation of the road. Finally, it was reported that there is no dispute or any court case pending on the subject land and the requested to confirm the genuineness of the settlement order from Collector's office.

The matter was got enquired by the then Joint Collector, Visakhapatnam and preliminary report is as follows:

"The subject land in Sy.No.133 of Madhurawada village of Visakhapatnam Rural Mandal has been inspected on 05.09.2023 along with Tahsildar, Visakhapatnam Rural, Revenue Divisional Officer, Bheemunipatnam, Village Revenue Officer, Madhurawada, Revenue Inspector, Visakhapatnam Rural AE & DE. AP Housing Board and found that the subject land is vacant, barren and there are no traces of cultivation and covered by fencing poles on all sides, there seems a slabbed board of Aiswarya Developers on one side with damaged pole.

The claim of the petitioner is that they have been in continuous possession and enjoyment from 1931, but one can see that they are neither in possession and nor in enjoyment. Further they are contending that neelgiri plants are there on ground which were said to be raised by their father but was visible clearly that there are no plants on ground and the land is vacant is on ground

During the inspection it was reported by both the housing hoard officials as well as the local VRO that there were multiple attempts of land grabbing during the tenure of the then Tahsildar Sri M.Paul Kiran where the field staff were sent when there was information regarding entry of third party into the subject land which were stopped then. The same Grade-II VRO is now continuing who had accompanied the surveyor & Revenue Inspector while enquiring on the representation of the present applicant no objection has been raised not the previous issue that had cropped up were reported. This is a clear case of brazen dereliction of duty. The RI has also not done proper verification as will he explained in detail subsequently.

Subsequent to this he has gone to the Tahsildar office and gone through the file and found that in the first page the RDO sent a request to Tahsildar for enquiry with the enclosures duly enclosing the letter from the Magisterial section, Collector office, the alleged settlement order, CCLA's memo, representation of the petitioner addressed to the Spl.CS, Revenue, report of the Revenue Inspector report of the Mandal Surveyor, Sketch, report of the Tahsildar addressed to the Collector through the RDO.

On perusal of the report of the Revenue Inspector, he has reported that "the petitioner has stated that Sri Nagathu Satyanarayana and Nagothu Nanaji Sons of Late Appalaswamy Patrudu of Nagarampalein area, Madhurawada village in Visakhapatnam (Rural) Mandal are an absolute owner of the property measuring Ac.3.47 cents in Old S.No.281 correlates to RS No.133 part of Madhurawada village in Visakhapatnam Taluka. The subject land in Old S.No. 281

(P.T.O)

admeasuring Ac.5.22 cents of Madhurawada village, Erstwhile Visakhapatnam Taluka within the ambit of Vizianagaram Estate is stands classified as "Zeroyathi Dry as per Gilman Survey and Settlement Register 1903 of Madhurawada village The ancestors of the above named two petitioners i.e., great grandfather NagothoSingaiah purchased the subject land measuring about Ac. 3.47 cents out of Ac.5.22 cents in Old S.No.281 of Madhurawada village through Regd Sale deed No.808/1931 dated 23.6.1931 and the said property is under possession and enjoy pent since 1931 to ill to date without any hindrance. But there is no sale deed in the file, there is no discussion regarding the sale deed and no attempt to check the authenticity from the sub-registrar.

"It is further stated that, the subject land in Madhurawada village was taken over by the Government U/s.1(4) of Estate Abolition Act. 1948 and survey and settlement operations were conducted in the year 1956 and SFA and Survey records were got prepared. According to SFA/MDR of Madhurawada village the land in Old S.No.281 correlates to RS No. 133 wrongly classified as Rastha measuring to an extent Ac.9.36. Though the said land of Ac 3.47 cents is out of Ac.9.36 cents in RS No.133 of Madhurawada village is under continuous possession and enjoyment of the Nagothu family since 1931 i.e. from the date of purchase of the said land. Due to lack of knowledge of the father of the petitioner. that the wrong classification entered in the SEA was known to the lather of the petitioners during 1967-68 and as such, the father of the petitioners approached the settlement authorities by filing a claim petition u/s11(a) of EA Act 1948 alongwith their grandfather purchased sale deed dated 23.61931 praying to grant Settlement Ryothwartpatta (Document enclosed).

But the Revenue inspector has not shown his concern about the authenticity of the alleged settlement order.

"Further stated that the Settlement Officer, Visakhapatnam after due enquiry and examine the revenue officials and after verification pre and post abolition records and also examination of their ancestral sale deed dated 23.6.1931 and allowed patta for Ac.3.47 out of Ac.9.36 cents in Old S.No.281 correlates to RS No. 133 part of Madhurawada village vide Progs.SR No.11(a)/23/68/Vsp. dt.29.11.1969 (Order enclosed). In the settlement patta order dt29.11.1969, the SO directed the Tahsildar, Erstwhile Visakhapatnam Taluka to make necessary sub-division records duly set apart petitioner's allowable land admeasuring Ac.3.47 cents in Old S.No.281 correlates to present S.No.133 part of Madhurawada village. Visakhapatnam Taluka and make necessary incorporations in the Settlement Fair Adangal and 10(1) and FMB records accordingly. But on repeated requests by the petitioner's father since 1969 to 1985, no action was initiated by the Revenue Taluka officials and no appeals were preferred against the said decision within the statutory period under E.A. Act, 1948. But, the land remains under continuous possesstion and enjoyment of the petitioners herein. In the meanwhile, Mandal Administration set up same into force with effect from 28.5.1985, the said village comes under jurisdiction of Visakhapatnam (Rural) known as Chinagadila Mandal. After prolonged requests with the then MROS, Visakhapatnam (Rural) by the petitioners' father and petitioners, and after physical verification, manual Pattadar Pass Book bearing Pass Book No,159353 hearing ROR IB Khata No.41 issued for the said land measuring A 3.47 cents by quoting wrong Sy.No.145/19 of Madhurawada village during 1995-96. During the introduction of the Webland online portal, the then Tahsildar Visakhapatnam (Rural) record the said entry in the name of petitioner's father Sri Nagothu Appalaswamy Patrudu and also issued online 18 data mentioning the wrong Sy.No.145/19 of Madhurawada.

But there are no incorporations in any of the records Le SFA, 10(1). FMB. While the SFA, 10(1) are not available at Mandal level and only FMB is available and no incorporation of sub-division are present and there is no such discussion in the report.

Further no discussion regarding genuinity of the PPB No.159353. Khata No.41 in the report. Ironically no such survey number even exists in any record.

In fact, the said land in Sy.No.145 of Madhurawada Village (Adjacem their land) was sub-divided into Sy.No.145/1 to 18, but no such Sy.No.145/19 was there. Recently due to urbanization of the said property and included within the GVMC limits, the digital signature of the said land was revoked by the then Tahsildar. Visakhapatnam (Rural) and on enquiry, it is informed that no agricultural operation was made in the said land.

(Contd..3)

The then Joint Collector, Visakhapatnam has inspected the land in Sy.No.133 for an extent of Ac. 3.47 Cts in Madhurawada Revenue village of Visakhapatnam Rural Mandal along with mandal surveyor and village revenue officer, Madhurawada and identified that the following are the details of the land status on ground and as per the registered documents produced by the individuals.

Name of the village	As on ground Sy.No./Sd. No	As on ground extent	Old Sy.No.	Total extent AC.Cts.	Classification as per MDR/SFA/Adngal	Remarks
Madhurawada	133/P	3.47	281	9.36	Poramboke (Rasta)	Vacant
		0.51				Existing drain
Total		Ac.3.98 Cts				

But why was there a discussion regarding 133/P? The report seems to be pushing the version of the applicant, even though when there was no sub-division done or separate demarcation in FMB or physically on ground.

The then Joint Collector, Visakhapatnam further submit that as per the revenue records available in this office the details of the situated in Sy.No.133/P of madhurawada village of Visakhapatnam Rural Mandal noted against the available records as follows:

As per scanned MDR:

Sy. No.	Extent as per scanned MDR	Classification as per scanned MDR	KhataNo. and Pattadar as per scanned MDR
133	9.36	Poramboke	Rasta

As per VA.No-3 (Adangal) for the Fasali-1419:

Sy. No.	Extent as per VA.No-3 for the Fasali-1419	Classification as per VA.No-3 for the Fasali -1419	Name of the Khatadar as per VA.No-3 for the Fasali-1419	Name of the enjoyer as per VA.No-3 for the Fasali-1419	Enjoinder Extent
133	9.36	Poramboke	Rasta		

The above records shown the subject land as a Government land and also clearly APHB was mentioned, but there is no further discussion on this aspect.

As per webland:

Sy. No.	Extent as per webland	Classification as per webland	Khatadar No. as per webland	Name of the Khatadar as per webland	Remarks
133	9.36	Road	20001304	Road	Govt. land

As per scanned 1-B:

Sy. No.	Extent as per 1-B Register	Khata No.	Name of the Khatadar as per 1-B Register
No entries			

The Revenue Inspector has finally reported that,

- Presently on ground is the status is vacant.
- As seen from Mandal Surveyor report the total measuring an extent of land in Sy.No.133 is Ac.3.98 Cts and as per the Webland Sy.No.133 admeasuring Ac.9.36 Cts recorded as Road.

(Contd..4)

- SFA copy is not available in this office. Only MDR&V.A.No.3 adangals available.
- Further as verified from the 22A list Sy.No.133 admeasuring Ac.9.36 Cts is notified u/s.22(A)(1)(a) recorded as Rasta".

Even though there is no recommendation finally in the report of the Revenue Inspector, the silence in checking and answering claims raised by the petitioner is glaringly visible. No discussion at all regarding the PPB Khata No, mentioned in the report. When the claims of the petitioner that they are in possession with neelgiri trees, no attempt was made to go into the details denying their possession,

Therefore, the report of the Revenue inspector simply reads the contentions of the petitioner and when the records and physical possession are evidently showing the contentions of the petitioner as unsound, there is no denial at any point in any aspect, but simply pushed the version of the petitioner without any specific observations.

Further, even though the Tahsildar has not recommended the case of the applicant, the Tahsildar has simply carried forward the report of the Revenue Inspector and failed to check for the genuinity of the settlement order, and authenticity of the documents produced by the applicant and also he has not cared to verify the previous correspondence available in the office pertaining to the subject Government land neither has rechecked for incorporations of the said settlement order in any of the previous revenue records.

And the original file of handing over of the subject land was found along with the correspondence in the Tahsildar office which was seems to have been taken out after calling explanation by the Collector on submission of inappropriate reports by the Tahsildar and the RDO.

On perusal of the said original file, it is found that the then Mandal Revenue Officer, Visakhapatnam Rural who submitted the alienation proposals in respect of the subject lands along with other lands vide RC.No.355/2005/Spl.RI Dt.24.04.2006 in favour of the AP Housing Board is the present Revenue Divisional Officer, Bheemunipatnam and also he is the then Mandal Revenue Officer, Visakhapatnam who handed over the subject land to the Dy.EE, AP Housing Board vide delivery receipt in RC.No.355/2005/Spl.RI Dt.12.05.2005.

And it is very outrageous that when the subject land was already alienated to AP housing Board long back, there is no single line of discussion regarding alienation aspect in the entire reports in any of the field level functionaries.

In fact when the field level functionaries on seeing the name of the APHB recorded in the V.A.No.3 adangals against the subject land, they would have made a communication with the concerned department before sending report to the higher authorities for confirmation, but it was not done at any level.

All the above lapses shows the inattentiveness of the Tahsildar, RDO in the important matters and thus right from the Village Revenue Officer, Revenue Inspector, Tahsildar to the Revenue Divisional Officer, all have grossly failed in discharging their legitimate duties in an effective manner either in collusion with the applicant and his ill intentions of grabbing valuable government land or out of complete incompetence. He inclined to believe the former especially with the same RDO, when during his tenure as MRO having handed over this land to the APHB now casually ignoring this inspite of V.A.No.3 adangal entry showing clearly as the land belonging to APHB and recommended that, strict action may be initiated against all the officials involved from the VRO, RI, MRO to the RDO so as to prevent such brazen mischief from being repeated in the future.

Basing on the report of the then Joint Collector, Visakhapatnam, disciplinary proceedings are initiated against the individuals who are responsible for not checking the connected records and when the claims of the petitioner that they are in possession with neelagiri trees, no attempt was made to go into the details denying their possession and it is very outrageous that when the subject land was already alienated to AP Housing Board long back. Sri S. Bhaskara Reddy, Revenue Divisional Officer, Bheemunipatnam has failed to report the matter to the higher authorities regarding alienation aspect even during the field inspection. In fact when the field level functionaries on seeing the name of the APIIB recorded in the V.A.No.3 Adangals against the subject land, they would have made a communication with the concerned department for confirmation, but it was not done at any level.

(Contd..5)

Therefore, Sri S. Bhaskara Reddy, Revenue Divisional Officer, Bheemunipatnam is hereby directed to show cause as to why disciplinary proceedings should not be initiated against the dereliction in discharging legitimate duties who submitted falsified report to the District Collector, Visakhapatnam and kept silent without rejecting the claim though it is a Government land le, Rasta poramboke.

The above incumbent is hereby directed to submit his written explanation within (07) days from the date of receipt of this notice, failing which, it will be construed that there is no explanation to offer and further action will be initiated against them basing on the material available and as per the Rules applicable.

Thus, Sri S. Bhaskara Reddy, Revenue Divisional Officer. Bheemunipatnam, Visakhapatnam District has failed to maintain integrity which amounts to violation of the Rule-3(1) of A.P. Civil Services (Conduct) Rules 1964: Every Government employee shall be devoted to his duty and shall maintain absolute integrity, discipline, impartiality and a sense of propriety and Rule 3(3) of A.P. Civil Services (Conduct) Rules, 1964: No Government employee shall act in a manner which will place his official position under any kind of embarrassment. Hence, the charges.

R.P. SISODIA
SPECIAL CHIEF SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT (LANDS, R&S)

//FORWARDED::BY ORDER//

SECTION OFFICER

ANNEXURE-III

LIST OF DOCUMENTS BY WHICH THE ARTICLE OF CHARGES FRAMED AGAINST SRI S. BHASKARA REDDY, REVENUE DIVISIONAL OFFICER, BHEEMUNIPATNAM, VISAKHAPATNAM DISTRICT ARE PROPOSED TO BE SUSTAINED

***

1	Rc.No.383/2023/A, dt.21.06.2023 of the Tahsildar, Visakhapatnam Rural
2	Rc.No.1187/2023/B, dt.08.08.2023 of the Revenue Divisional Officer, Bheemunipatnam.
3	Report of the Joint Collector, Visakhapatnam vide Computer No.352998/2023/E3 Dt.17/10/2023.
4	Report of the Executive Engineer (Hg), A.P. Housing Board, Visakhapatnam vide Lr.No.5339/Police Case /PMP/EE-VSP/2023, dated 07.03.2023 addressed to the SHO, P.M.Palem PS, Bakkapalem Road, Madhurawada, Visakhapatnam 41.

R.P. SISODIA
SPECIAL CHIEF SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT (LANDS, R&S)

//FORWARDED::BY ORDER//

SECTION OFFICER

ANNEXURE-IV

LIST OF WITHNESSES BY WHOM THE ARTICLE OF CHARGES FRAMED AGAINST SRI S.BHASKARA REDDY, REVENUE DIVISIONAL OFFICER, BHEEMUNIPATNAM, VISAKHAPATNAM DISTRICT PROPOSED TO BE SUSTAINED.

***

-Nil-

R.P. SISODIA
SPECIAL CHIEF SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT (LANDS, R&S)

//FORWARDED::BY ORDER//

SECTION OFFICER